



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1459
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1459
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/687,336

10/16/2003

John T. Kilcoyne

1065-012US05

7853

28863 7590 06/27/2007
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P. A.
1625 RADIO DRIVE
SUITE 300
WOODBURY, MN 55125

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HUONG Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3736

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/27/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/687,336

Applicant(s)

KILCOYNE ET AL.

Examiner

Helen Nguyen

Art Unit

3736

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 50-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 50-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/12/2007.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the reply filed 1/12/2007. **Claims 50-57** remain pending.

Priority

2. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged, namely, priority as a divisional of application 09/544373 now US Pat No. 6689056, which is a CIP of application 09/287617 now US Pat No. 6285897, filed on 4/7/1999.

3. It is noted that due to the above priority, various elements of the instant application may claim benefit to different priority dates. For example, the teachings of "a plurality of sensors" is only granted a date of 4/6/2000 as introduced in the divisional above.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 1/12/2007 is/are acknowledged. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: p.22 line 13 of the specification contains handwritten cross outs that appear to have not been corrected with the previous amendments to the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 50-55** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schulman et al (US Pat No. 6088608) in view of Brune (US Pat No. 5984875).

8. In regard to **Claims 50 and 55**, Schulman et al disclose a system for measuring physiological parameters in the body of a patient, such as gastroesophageal reflux, the system comprising:

a plurality of sensors 10a-c etc. adapted to be implanted in the body of a patient (Col.3: 32-46), where each of the plurality of sensors periodically measures a physiological parameter indicative of gastroesophageal reflux such as pH (Col.4: 59-64) and wherein each of the plurality of sensors periodically transmits a signal indicative of the physiological that is indicative of a gastroesophageal reflux (Col.5: 16-23);

a receiver 16 that receives the signals from the plurality of sensors and records the signals.

9. However, Schulman et al do not disclose each signal transmitted by the plurality of sensors includes an identifier that is indicative of the sensor from which the signal is sent. Brune

et al disclose an analogous measuring system comprising sensors 2 that transmit a signal including an identifier code that is indicative of the sensor from which the signal is sent (Col.5: 49-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include with the signals sent from the implanted sensors of Schulman et al an identifier code as taught by Brune to effectively differentiate the particular sensor from which each signal was sent.

10. In regards to **Claim 51**, Schulman et al disclose the plurality of sensors includes a pH monitor (Col.4: 64) but do not explicitly disclose said sensors including an RF transmitter. Brune teaches the use of an RF transmitter 9,10 to transmit the signals from an analogous implanted sensor 2 (Col.6: 40-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Schulman et al so that the plurality of sensors include an RF monitor as an effective means to transmit the signal information wirelessly.

11. In regards to **Claim 52**, Schulman et al in combination with Brune disclose the plurality of sensors above including pH monitors and RF transmitters to periodically send an RF signal indicative of the pH measured by the pH monitor as explained above but do not explicitly disclose the plurality of sensors each includes a microprocessor that periodically receives a signal from the pH monitor and induces the RF transmitter to periodically send an RF signal indicative of the pH measured by the pH monitor. Brune teaches analogous implanted sensor 2 includes a microprocessor 7 that periodically receives a signal from the sensor and induces the

RF transmitter to periodically send an RF signal indicative of the sensor (Col.6: 22-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the plurality of sensors of Schulman et al as modified by Brune to include a microprocessor that periodically receives a signal from the pH monitor and induces the RF transmitter to periodically send an RF signal indicative of the pH measured by the pH monitor as an effective means to periodically transmit the pH information signal.

12. In regard to **Claims 53-54**, Schulman et al in combination with Brune disclose the plurality of sensors each with a microprocessor above but do not explicitly disclose the microprocessor enables the pH monitor during a first interval and then disables the pH monitor during a second interval, while the RF transmitter is enabled during the second interval and disabled during periods of each cycle other than the second interval. However, Brune does disclose a first interval which is defined as when the microprocessor 7 periodically enables the sensor to obtain a signal and a second interval which is defined as when the RF transmitter 9,10 is enabled to transmit the signal (Col.6: 35-42). Brune also teaches that battery life is conserved by disabling the respective functions i.e. keeping the sensor in sleeping mode until it is necessary to trigger the signals (Col.6: 32-35).

13. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Schulman et al as modified by Brune such that during the first interval the RF transmitter is disabled and during the second interval the pH monitor is disabled, wherein the disabling occurs when the respective function is not performed, i.e. the pH monitor of the respective sensor is disabled during periods of each cycle other than

the first interval and the RF transmitter is disabled during periods of each cycle other than the second interval, as an effective way to enhance the battery life conservation by only enabling the proper function as it is being used and disabling it during all other times.

14. **Claims 56-57** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schulman et al in view of Brune, further in view of Kumar et al (US Pat No. 6416471). Schulman et al in combination with Brune disclose the receiver above but do not disclose the receiver worn by the patient or includes circuitry to sense the position of the patient. Kumar et al disclose an analogous receiver 20 worn by the patient best seen in Figure 1 as well as circuitry to sense a position of the patient (Col.11: 35-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the receiver of Schulman et al as modified by Brune to be worn by the patient and also include circuitry to sense a position of the patient as taught by Kumar et al for ease of transportation and to improve the invention by also providing valuable information pertaining to the position of the patient respectively, wherein it is then also obvious to one within the art for the receiver to also periodically record the position of the patient for the purpose of record.

Double Patenting

15. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re*

Art Unit: 3736

Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

16. **Claims 50-54** are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 33-34 and 37-38 of copending Application No. 10/687298 in view of Schulman et al and Brune. Copending application '298 recites in Claim 33 an implanted sensor for transmitting a signal indicative of a physiological parameter of gastroesophageal reflux to a receiver but does not recite a plurality of sensors and the signal with an identifier. Schulman et al disclose a plurality of implanted sensors for the advantage of cross checking the data and Brune discloses an implanted sensor with an identifier code for identification. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the implanted sensor to include a plurality of implanted sensors as well as the signal with an identifier as taught by Schulman et al and Brune respectively to advantageously allow checking of data for more accurate results and to be able to differentiate between the sensors from which each signal is sent from respectively.
17. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 50-57 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. While the Examiner does not necessarily agree with Applicant's arguments concerning the lack of obviousness for Brune to teach a plurality of implanted sensor as well as the supposed teaching away of Brune to using more than one implanted sensor in a single animal, the Examiner has set forth new grounds of rejection above citing at least Schulman et al in view of Brune in an effort to advance prosecution of the instant application.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helen Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-8340. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on 571-272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3736

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HQN
6/18/2007

gcn

Matthew Wendenburg
MATTHEW WENDENBURG
PATENT EXAMINER
EBC CENTER 3700